



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/030,896 | 03/04/2002 | Bruno Egner-Walter | VEP-501-A | 3844 |
| 7590 | 03/17/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| Andrew R Basile Young & Basile Suite 624 3001 West Big Beaver Road Troy, MI 48084 | | | | GRAHAM, GARY K |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1744 | |
| DATE MAILED: 03/17/2004 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/030,896 | EGNER-WALTER, BRUNO |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Gary K Graham | 1744 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12112001.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4, 11, 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 4, line 2, having the claim depend from claim 4 is improper. A claim cannot depend from itself. The claim has been treated as though it depends from claim 1.

In claim 11, line 4, there is no antecedent basis for "the underside" and "the remaining part".

In claim 13, line 2, there is no antecedent basis for "its projection". No projection has been set forth.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1744

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11-14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smithers (U.S patent 3,088,155).

The patent to Smithers discloses the invention as is claimed. Note figure 2 which shows a profiled airfoil cover (10) which is mounted to protruding parts of both of the splines (14) as is claimed. The cover is of flexible plastics and is considered to be an “airfoil”, at least in the broadest sense.

With respect to claim 6, the grooves of Smithers are considered to define “catches” at least as far as is claimed.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson (U.S patent 3,372,422).

The patent to Anderson discloses the invention as is claimed. Note component (14) which acts as a cover for the splines (13). Such cover engages a protruding portion of the splines outside of the grooves (12) and covers a portion of the splines. Note figure 4 wherein it can be seen that the cover engages a longitudinal side of a portion (6) of the wiper blade body (3). Also, note projection (20) that engages in notch (8) in the spline.

With respect to claim 14, the wiper blade body has first and second airfoil surfaces on an upper side thereof (pair of slanted surfaces, note figure 5).

With respect to claim 15, note that a surface of the cover is adjacent to or adjoins the surface on the blade body.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smithers (U.S patent 3,088,155) in view of French patent 27479977.

The patent to Smithers discloses all of the above recited subject matter with the exception of a fluid passage provided on the cover and such passage being coupled to a fluid source.

The French patent discloses an airfoil "cover" (10) for coupling with the wiper blade (12). Such cover includes a fluid passage (26) thereon which is coupled with a fluid source.

It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to provide the cover of Smithers with a fluid passage which is coupled with a fluid source, as clearly suggested by the French patent, to enable wetting of the windshield, to enhance cleaning thereof.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary K Graham whose telephone number is 571-272-1274. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday (6:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Warden can be reached on 571-272-1281. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Gary K Graham
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1744

GKG
08 March 2004